arXiv:1512.01049v4 [nucl-th] 4 Aug 2016

# *Ab initio* calculations of charge symmetry breaking in the $A = 4$ hypernuclei

Daniel Gazda[1, 2, 3, *] and Avraham Gal[4, †]

[1] *Nuclear Physics Institute, 25068 Řež, Czech Republic*
[2] *ECT*, Villa Tambosi, 38123 Villazzano (Trento), Italy*
[3] *Department of Fundamental Physics, Chalmers University of Technology, SE-412 96 Göteborg, Sweden*
[4] *Racah Institute of Physics, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel*

(Dated: August 5, 2016)

We report on *ab initio* no-core shell model calculations of the mirror Λ hypernuclei ${}^{4}_{\Lambda}$H and ${}^{4}_{\Lambda}$He, using the Bonn-Jülich leading-order chiral effective field theory hyperon-nucleon potentials plus a charge symmetry breaking Λ-$\Sigma^0$ mixing vertex. In addition to reproducing rather well the $0^+_{\rm g.s.}$ and $1^+_{\rm exc.}$ binding energies, these four-body calculations demonstrate for the first time that the observed charge symmetry breaking splitting of mirror levels, reaching hundreds of keV for $0^+_{\rm g.s.}$, can be reproduced using realistic theoretical interaction models, although with a non-negligible momentum cutoff dependence. Our results are discussed in relation to recent measurements of the ${}^{4}_{\Lambda}$H$(0^+_{\rm g.s.})$ binding energy [MAMI A1 Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 232501 (2015)] and the ${}^{4}_{\Lambda}$He$(1^+_{\rm exc.})$ excitation energy [J-PARC E13 Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 222501 (2015)].

PACS numbers: 21.80.+a, 13.75.Ev, 11.30.-j, 21.60.De

**Introduction.** Charge symmetry in hadronic physics is broken in QCD by the up-down light quark mass difference and by the up and down quark QED interactions. Recent lattice QCD+QED simulations of octet baryon mass differences within isospin multiplets, such as the neutron-proton mass difference $\Delta_{np}$ which vanishes in the limit of charge symmetry, account nicely for the observed charge symmetry breaking (CSB) pattern in the lowest-mass nonstrange as well as strange baryon spectrum [1]. A comparable level of precision in reproducing theoretically CSB effects in the baryon-baryon interaction is lacking [2]. In practice, introducing two charge-dependent contact interaction terms in chiral effective field theory (EFT) applications, one is able at next-to-next-to-next-to-leading order (N3LO) to account quantitatively for the charge dependence of the low-energy nucleon-nucleon ($NN$) scattering parameters [3]. For strangeness $S = -1$, however, given that low-energy $\Lambda p$ cross sections are poorly known and $\Lambda n$ scattering data do not exist, the available chiral EFT hyperon-nucleon ($YN$) interactions [4, 5] do not include charge-dependent interaction terms. Potentially unique information on CSB in the $\Lambda N$ interaction and in Λ hypernuclei is provided by the large Λ separation-energy difference $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0}$=350±60 keV [6] in the $A = 4$ mirror hypernuclei $0^+$ ground states (g.s.) and the apparently negligible difference $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=1}$ in the $1^+$ excited states [7], see Fig. 1. Here, $\Delta B_\Lambda^J \equiv B_\Lambda^J({}^{4}_{\Lambda}{\rm He}) - B_\Lambda^J({}^{4}_{\Lambda}{\rm H})$. The recent precise measurement of the ${}^{4}_{\Lambda}{\rm H}_{\rm g.s.} \to {}^{4}{\rm He} + \pi^-$ decay at the Mainz Microtron (MAMI) [8] reaffirms a substantial CSB g.s. splitting $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0}$=270±95 keV, which is consistent with the emulsion value cited above. Note that $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0}$ is considerably larger than the ≈70 keV assigned to CSB splitting in the mirror core nuclei ${}^{3}$H and ${}^{3}$He [9].

Dalitz and von Hippel [10] suggested that the SU(3) octet $\Lambda_{I=0}$ and $\Sigma^0_{I=1}$ hyperons are admixed in the physical Λ hyperon, thereby generating a CSB direct $\Lambda N$ potential $V_{\rm CSB}$ that consists of isovector meson exchanges, notably a long-range one-pion exchange (OPE) component. Although these exchanges are forbidden in the $\Lambda N$ channel by the strong interactions (SI), they do contribute strongly to the $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ coupling potential. Quite generally, the matrix element of $V_{\rm CSB}$ arising from $\Lambda - \Sigma^0$ mixing is related to the SI $I_{NY} = 1/2$ matrix element $\langle N\Sigma|V_{\rm SI}|N\Lambda\rangle$ by [11]

$$\langle N\Lambda|V_{\rm CSB}|N\Lambda\rangle = -0.0297\,\tau_{Nz}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\,\langle N\Sigma|V_{\rm SI}|N\Lambda\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $\tau_{Nz} = \pm 1$ for protons and neutrons, respectively, and the space-spin structure of this $N\Sigma$ state is taken identical with that of the $N\Lambda$ state embracing $V_{\rm CSB}$. The




FIG. 1: (${}^{4}_{\Lambda}$H, ${}^{4}_{\Lambda}$He) mirror hypernuclei level diagram. The $0^+_{\rm g.s.}$ Λ separation energies $B_\Lambda$, loosely termed Λ binding energies, are from emulsion work [6], and the $1^+_{\rm exc.}$ $B_\Lambda$ values follow from γ-ray measurements of the excitation energies $E_\gamma$ [7].




FIG. 2: CSB $\Lambda N$ interaction diagram describing a SI $V_{\Lambda N-\Sigma N}$ interaction followed by a CSB $\Lambda-\Sigma^0$ mass-mixing vertex.

CSB scale coefficient 0.0297 in (1) follows from the $\Lambda-\Sigma^0$ mass-mixing matrix element [12]

$$\langle\Sigma^0|\delta M|\Lambda\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(\Delta_{\Sigma^0\Sigma^+} - \Delta_{np}) = 1.14(5)\ \text{MeV} \quad (2)$$

and has been used in all previous CSB works listed below. A visualization of Eq. (1) is provided by the CSB $\Lambda N$ interaction diagram of Fig. 2, where the $V_{\Lambda N-\Sigma N}$ blob represents *any* SI isovector meson exchange or contact term such as introduced in chiral EFT models [4].

Precise four-body calculations using the Nijmegen soft-core realistic meson exchange $YN$ interaction models $\text{NSC97}_{\text{e,f}}$ [13], which include charge-dependent interactions induced by $\Lambda-\Sigma^0$ mixing and meson mixings, produced at most 30% of the observed CSB g.s. splitting $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0}$ [14–18]. Below we comment on this insufficiency. More recent Nijmegen [19] or quark-cluster [20] models have not been used in four-body studies. With SI $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ potential energy contributions of order 10 MeV [14], and with a CSB scale of order 3%, Eq. (1) could yield CSB contributions of order 300 keV. Reproducing the observed CSB splitting poses a challenge for microscopic $YN$ interaction models.

In this Letter we report on detailed *ab initio* no-core shell model (NCSM) calculations of the $A=4$ $\Lambda$ hypernuclei that employ the SI Bonn-Jülich LO chiral EFT $YN$ interaction potentials [4], plus a CSB $\Lambda-\Sigma^0$ mixing interaction potential $V_{\rm CSB}$ generated by applying Eq. (1) to each one of the $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ $V_{\rm SI}$ components in this LO version. CSB meson mixings, with negligible contributions in the $A$=4 hypernuclei [21], are disregarded here. In addition to reproducing reasonably well the $0^+_{\rm g.s.}$ and $1^+_{\rm exc.}$ binding energies, these four-body calculations establish for the first time as large CSB splittings $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0}$ as suggested by experiment, see Fig. 1, although with a non-negligible cutoff dependence. We also discuss possible implications to the recent Bonn-Jülich-Munich NLO chiral EFT $YN$ interaction model [5].

**Methodology.** The nuclear NCSM technique used in the present four-body calculations employs realistic two-body and three-body model interactions and is formulated in a translationally invariant Jacobi-coordinate harmonic-oscillator (HO) basis [22]. Antisymmetrization with respect to nucleons is exercised in order to satisfy the Pauli principle. The resulting Hamiltonian is diagonalized in finite four-body HO bases, admitting all HO excitation energies $N\hbar\omega$, $N \le N_{\rm max}$, up to $N_{\rm max}$ HO quanta. Extrapolated energy values $E(\omega)$, $N_{\rm max}\to\infty$, are obtained by fitting an exponential function to $E(N_{\rm max}, \omega$ fixed) sequences in the vicinity of the variational minima with respect to the HO basis frequency $\omega$. The reliability of such extrapolations is then reflected in the independence of $E(\omega)$ of the frequency $\omega$.

TABLE I: Cutoff dependence of $\Lambda$ separation energies $B_\Lambda^J$ in ${}^4_\Lambda$H and ${}^4_\Lambda$He (all in MeV) from *ab initio* NCSM calculations at $\hbar\omega$=30(32) MeV for $J$=0(1), using N3LO (LO) chiral $NN$ ($YN$) interactions [3] ([4]) plus Coulomb interactions, and $V_{\rm CSB}$ generated by Eq. (1) from the LO SI $YN$ potentials. Experimental values are from Fig. 1.

| Cutoff | 550 | 600 | 650 | 700 | Experiment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $B_\Lambda^{J=0}({}^4_\Lambda\text{H})$ | 2.556 | 2.308 | 2.154 | 2.196 | 2.04±0.04 |
| $B_\Lambda^{J=0}({}^4_\Lambda\text{He})$ | 2.586 | 2.444 | 2.398 | 2.490 | 2.39±0.03 |
| $B_\Lambda^{J=1}({}^4_\Lambda\text{H})$ | 1.744 | 1.359 | 1.067 | 0.877 | 0.95±0.04 |
| $B_\Lambda^{J=1}({}^4_\Lambda\text{He})$ | 1.572 | 1.166 | 0.839 | 0.654 | 0.98±0.03 |

This NCSM technique, extended recently to light hypernuclei [23, 24], is applied here to the $A$=4 mirror hypernuclei using chiral N3LO $NN$ and N2LO $NNN$ interactions [3, 25], respectively, both with a momentum cutoff of 500 MeV. These together with the Coulomb interaction reproduce the binding energies of the $A$=3 core nuclei. For the SI $YN$ coupled-channel potentials $V_{\rm SI}$, we use the Bonn-Jülich LO chiral EFT SU(3)-based model with cutoff momenta $\Lambda$ from 550 to 700 MeV [4] plus $V_{\rm CSB}$ evaluated from $V_{\rm SI}$ by using Eq. (1). Baryon mass differences within isomultiplets are incorporated. The reported calculations consist of fully converged ${}^3$H and ${}^3$He binding energies, and (${}^4_\Lambda$H, ${}^4_\Lambda$He) $0^+_{\rm g.s.}$ and $1^+_{\rm exc.}$ binding energies extrapolated to infinite model spaces from $N_{\rm max}=18(14)$ for $J=0(1)$. The $NNN$ interaction is excluded from the calculations reported here, in order to save computing time, after verifying that its inclusion makes a difference of only a few keV in the calculation of the CSB splittings $\Delta B_\Lambda^J$ for both $J=0,1$.

**Results.** The cutoff dependence of $\Lambda$ separation energies in both $A$=4 mirror hypernuclei, obtained from NCSM calculations with LO chiral EFT coupled-channel $YN$ potentials [4] and $V_{\rm CSB}$ from Eq. (1), is shown in Table I. We used $N_{\rm max}\to\infty$ extrapolated binding-energy values for the ${}^4_\Lambda$He and ${}^4_\Lambda$H $J$=0(1) levels at fixed $\hbar\omega$=30(32) MeV, which is where the absolute variational minima occur for $\Lambda$=550 and 600 MeV. For higher values of $\Lambda$ the four-body absolute variational minima occur at slightly higher $\hbar\omega$ values. Although the spread of $B_\Lambda^J(\hbar\omega)$ values for a given cutoff momentum is of the order of 100 keV, it is considerably smaller and in fact marginal for the CSB splittings $\Delta B_\Lambda^J$ on which we focus here, as demonstrated by Fig. 4 below.

The $\Lambda$ separation energies listed in Table I show a




FIG. 3: (color online). Cutoff momentum dependence of excitation energies $E_x(0^+_{g.s.} \to 1^+_{exc.})$ in $^4_\Lambda$H (squares) and $^4_\Lambda$He (circles) in *ab initio* NCSM calculations, at $\hbar\omega$=30(32) MeV for $J$=0(1), for LO chiral EFT coupled-channel $YN$ potentials [4] with (solid lines) and without (dashed lines) $V_{CSB}$ derived from these SI potentials using Eq. (1). The dotted horizontal lines denote $E_x$ values from $\gamma$-ray measurements [7].




FIG. 4: (color online). Dependence of the separation-energy differences $\Delta B_\Lambda$ between $^4_\Lambda$He and $^4_\Lambda$H, for $0^+_{g.s.}$ (upper curve) and for $1^+_{exc.}$ (lower curve) on the HO $\hbar\omega$ in *ab initio* NCSM calculations using LO chiral EFT coupled-channel $YN$ potentials with cutoff momentum $\Lambda$=600 MeV [4] plus $V_{CSB}$ derived from these SI potentials using Eq. (1). Results for other values of $\Lambda$ are shown at $\hbar\omega$=30(32) MeV for $J$=0(1).

moderate cutoff dependence for the $0^+_{g.s.}$ mirror levels and a stronger dependence for the $1^+_{exc.}$ mirror levels, with mean values for their charge-symmetric (CS) averages given by $\overline{B}^{CS}_\Lambda(0^+_{g.s.})=2.39^{+0.18}_{-0.12}$ MeV and $\overline{B}^{CS}_\Lambda(1^+_{exc.})=1.16^{+0.50}_{-0.39}$ MeV which compare well with the CS-averaged experimental values derived from the last column in Table I. Furthermore, considering NCSM $N_{max}\to\infty$ extrapolation uncertainties, our CS-averaged $B_\Lambda$ values are in fair agreement with those reported in other four-body calculations using CS LO $YN$ chiral EFT interactions [16–18, 23, 24]. A detailed analysis of calculational uncertainties will be given elsewhere.

Shown in Fig. 3 by solid lines is the cutoff momentum dependence of the $0^+_{g.s.} \to 1^+_{exc.}$ excitation energies $E_x$ formed from the $B_\Lambda$ values listed in Table I for both $A$=4 mirror hypernuclei. As observed in several few-body calculations of $s$-shell hypernuclei [26–29], $E_x$ is strongly correlated with the $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ coupling potential which in the present context, through $\Lambda-\Sigma^0$ mixing, gives rise to CSB splittings of the $A$=4 mirror levels.

Figure 3 demonstrates a steady rise of both $E_x(^4_\Lambda\mathrm{He})$ and $E_x(^4_\Lambda\mathrm{H})$ as a function of the cutoff momentum $\Lambda$, with a CS-averaged value $\overline{E}^{CS}_x=1.23^{+0.35}_{-0.32}$ MeV compared to 1.25±0.02 MeV deduced from the two $\gamma$-ray energies shown in Fig. 1. A steady rise is also observed in the difference $\Delta E^{CSB}_x$ with a mean value $380^{+140}_{-180}$ keV compared to 320±20 keV, again from Fig. 1. In agreement with previous calculations [14–18], residual CSB contributions of up to 30 keV from electromagnetic mass differences, mostly of $\Sigma$ hyperons, and from the increased Coulomb repulsion in the $^3$He core of $^4_\Lambda$He, survive upon switching off $V_{CSB}$, as demonstrated by the slight difference between the two middle dashed lines in the figure.

In Fig. 4 we show the $\hbar\omega$ dependence of separation-energy differences $\Delta B^J_\Lambda$ between $^4_\Lambda$He and $^4_\Lambda$H levels of a given spin $J$, for $0^+_{g.s.}$ and $1^+_{exc.}$, using $N_{max}\to\infty$ extrapolated values for the four possible binding energies which are calculated for a cutoff $\Lambda$=600 MeV and including $V_{CSB}$ from Eq. (1). Extrapolation uncertainties for $\Delta B^J_\Lambda$ are about 20 keV. The variation of $\Delta B^{J=0}_\Lambda$ in the spanned $\hbar\omega$ range amounts to a few keV, whereas that of $\Delta B^{J=1}_\Lambda$ is larger, amounting to ∼30 keV. It is worth noting that the difference $\Delta B^{J=0}_\Lambda - \Delta B^{J=1}_\Lambda$ between the upper and lower curves assumes at $\Lambda$=600 MeV the value 0.33±0.04 MeV, in perfect agreement with the difference $E_\gamma(^4_\Lambda\mathrm{He}) - E_\gamma(^4_\Lambda\mathrm{H}) = 0.32 \pm 0.02$ MeV between the two $\gamma$ ray energies shown in Fig. 1. The figure also demonstrates a strong cutoff dependence of $\Delta B^{J=0}_\Lambda$, varying between 30 and 300 keV upon increasing $\Lambda$, together with a considerably weaker cutoff dependence of $\Delta B^{J=1}_\Lambda$, varying between −170 and −230 keV. Note that $\Delta B^{J=0}_\Lambda$ comes out invariably positive, whereas $\Delta B^{J=1}_\Lambda$ is robustly negative. With mean values $\overline{\Delta B}^{J=0}_\Lambda=176^{+118}_{-146}$ keV and $\overline{\Delta B}^{J=1}_\Lambda=-204^{+32}_{-24}$ keV, the mean values $\overline{\Delta B}^J_\Lambda$ satisfy

$$\overline{\Delta B}^{J=1}_\Lambda \approx -\overline{\Delta B}^{J=0}_\Lambda < 0. \qquad (3)$$

**Discussion.** To understand the CSB pattern Eq. (3) for the $A$=4 hypernuclei, we note that the SI $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ coupling potential in the LO chiral EFT $YN$ model of Ref. [4] consists of a pseudoscalar (PS) meson exchange, dominated by OPE, plus two $s$-wave interaction contact terms (CT) of which the $^3S_1$ CT is negligible and the $^1S_0$

CT is large. In a zeroth-order single-particle description of the $A$=4 hypernuclei, and using Eq. (1), these $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ coupling-potential components contribute to the CSB separation-energy differences as follows:

$$\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0} = \frac{3}{2}C_1 - \frac{1}{2}C_0, \quad \Delta B_\Lambda^{J=1} = \frac{1}{2}C_1 + \frac{1}{2}C_0, \quad (4)$$

with $C_S = C_S^{\rm CT} + C_S^\pi$ the sum of contributions to the triplet ($S$=1) and singlet ($S$=0) matrix elements from CT and from OPE. The $\vec{\sigma}_Y \cdot \vec{\sigma}_N$ spin dependence of $C_S^\pi$ leads in this approximation to $C_1^\pi = -\frac{1}{3}C_0^\pi$. Recalling that these matrix elements already incorporate isospin, both $C_0^\pi$ and $C_0^{\rm CT}$ are negative. Hence,

$$\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0} \approx -\,(C_0^\pi + \frac{1}{2}C_0^{\rm CT}) > 0, \quad (5)$$

$$\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=1} \approx +\,(\frac{1}{3}C_0^\pi + \frac{1}{2}C_0^{\rm CT}) < 0, \quad (6)$$

in agreement with the signs of the calculated CSB splittings. In the limit that $C_0^\pi$ is negligible with respect to $C_0^{\rm CT}$, Eq. (3) is recovered. We conclude that it is the sizable $^1S_0$ $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ coupling-potential CT in the LO chiral EFT $YN$ interaction model [4] that makes it possible to generate sufficiently large values of $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0}$ to explain the observed CSB splitting of the $0^+_{\rm g.s.}$ mirror levels. However, the opposite-sign values of $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=1}$ appear too large with respect to the near degeneracy observed for the $1^+_{\rm exc.}$ mirror levels, even when updated values from the latest MAMI measurement are considered [30].

In contrast to the ability of the LO chiral EFT $YN$ interaction model to generate sizable CSB g.s. splittings $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0}$ owing to a dominant $^1S_0$ $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ coupling-potential CT, the $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ coupling potential in NSC97 models is dominated by a $^3S_1 - {}^3D_1$ tensor component which is ineffective in generating a large CSB contribution when used in the right-hand side of Eq. (1). The reason is that the SI $\Lambda N$ states on the left-hand side, in the case of NSC97, are dominated by purely $s$-wave channels [14]. The NSC97 $^1S_0$ $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ coupling-potential contribution that replaces $C_0^\pi$ in Eq. (5) is too weak to generate on its own a sizable $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0}$. A detailed account of this item will be given elsewhere.

It is tempting to speculate on the $A$=4 CSB separation-energy differences $\Delta B_\Lambda^J$ anticipated from applying Eq. (1) to the recently published NLO chiral EFT $YN$ interaction [5]. The $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ coupling-potential contact terms differ considerably in NLO from those in LO, with a very large $C_1^{\rm CT}$ that dominates in NLO over $C_0^{\rm CT}$, and with a new $^3S_1$–$^3D_1$ CT. It is fair to assume that PS one- and two-meson exchange contributions in NLO are still dominated by OPE. Dominance of $C_1^{\rm CT}$ over all other allowed contributions would result in *negative* values of $\Delta B_\Lambda^J$, with $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0}$ 3 times as large as $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=1}$; this would disagree with the observed positive value for $\Delta B_\Lambda^{J=0}$, see Fig. 1, confirmed also by the new MAMI measurement [8]. We note, furthermore, that the NLO version underestimates the $A$=4 hypernuclear g.s. separation energy, with $B_\Lambda^{\rm CS}$ ≈1.5–1.6 MeV [17], compared to ≈2.2 MeV from Fig. 1. Three-body $YNN$ interaction terms introduced in higher-order versions in order to recover the missing g.s. attraction might provide additional source of CSB in $\Lambda$ hypernuclei. However, expecting that the dominant $YNN$ terms correspond to $\Sigma^*(1385)NN$ intermediate states [31] and realizing that, unlike $\Sigma^0$, $\Sigma^{*0}(\frac{3}{2}^+)$ cannot mix with $\Lambda^0(\frac{1}{2}^+)$ to generate CSB, these $YNN$ interaction terms will not produce as strong CSB as evaluated here using Eq. (1), which is based on the Dalitz–von Hippel $\Lambda^0 - \Sigma^0$ mixing mechanism [10]. It is therefore questionable whether the NLO version [5] offers an advantage over the LO version [4] for $\Lambda$ hypernuclei, given also that both provide comparably reasonable fits to the low-energy $YN$ scattering data.

**Summary and outlook.** In conclusion, we have presented the first CSB *ab initio* calculation in hypernuclei with chiral EFT coupled-channel $YN$ interactions, showing that the LO version [4] is capable of producing a *large* CSB $0^+_{\rm g.s.}$ splitting $\overline{\Delta B}_\Lambda^{J=0} \sim 180 \pm 130$ keV. This is consistent with a g.s. splitting of 270±95 keV reported by the MAMI experiment [8]. Our NCSM calculation reproduces quantitatively and with weak cutoff dependence the $0^+_{\rm g.s.}$ binding energies of the $A$=4 mirror hypernuclei, whereas the $1^+_{\rm exc.}$ binding-energy calculation, which is known to be numerically more challenging [14], displays a strong cutoff dependence. The calculated CSB $1^+_{\rm exc.}$ splitting is of opposite sign to that of the $0^+_{\rm g.s.}$ splitting and fairly large: $\overline{\Delta B}_\Lambda^{J=1} \approx -200 \pm 30$ keV, with a weak cutoff dependence. While the latest results from MAMI suggest a smaller negative CSB splitting of $-83 \pm 94$ keV for the $1^+_{\rm exc.}$ mirror levels [30], the measurement systematic uncertainty is still too large to rule out the prediction of the LO version.

In future work it would be of great interest to apply the CSB generating equation (1) in *ab initio* calculations of the $A$=4 mirror hypernuclei using the recent NLO EFT version [5], and also to readjust the $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ contact terms in NLO by imposing the accurate CSB datum $E_\gamma(^4_\Lambda{\rm He}) - E_\gamma(^4_\Lambda{\rm H}) = 0.32 \pm 0.02$ MeV, so it is reproduced in four-body calculations with as weak cutoff dependence as possible. Another natural follow-up would be to extend these CSB calculations in LO and NLO to $p$-shell hypernuclei. Recent shell model calculations [11], using a schematic $\Lambda N \leftrightarrow \Sigma N$ coupling-potential model, suggest that CSB splittings of g.s. mirror levels in $p$-shell hypernuclei decrease in size with respect to $A = 4$, and perhaps even reverse sign, in rough agreement with old emulsion data [6]. Such extensions of the present work pose a valuable theoretical challenge to the microscopic understanding of strange nuclear systems.

**Acknowledgments**. We are grateful to Petr Navrátil

for providing valuable advice and help on extensions of nuclear-physics NCSM codes, to Johann Haidenbauer and Andreas Nogga for providing us with the input LO EFT $YN$ potentials used in the present work, to Nir Barnea for stimulating discussions on EFT few-body applications, and to Jiří Mareš for a critical reading of this manuscript. The research of D.G. was supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic (GACR) Grant No. P203/15/04301S.

* gazda@ujf.cas.cz
† avragal@savion.huji.ac.il

[1] S. Borsanyi *et al.*, Science **347**, 1452 (2015).
[2] S.R. Beane *et al.* (NPLQCD Collaboration), Phys. Rev. C **88**, 024003 (2013).
[3] D.R. Entem and R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. C **68**, 041001(R) (2003).
[4] H. Polinder, J. Haidenbauer, and U.-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. A **779**, 244 (2006).
[5] J. Haidenbauer, S. Petschauer, N. Kaiser, U.-G. Meißner, A. Nogga, and W. Weise, Nucl. Phys. A **915**, 24 (2013).
[6] D.H. Davis, Nucl. Phys. A **754**, 3c (2005).
[7] T.O. Yamamoto *et al.* (J-PARC E13 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 222501 (2015).
[8] A. Esser *et al.* (A1 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 232501 (2015).
[9] G.A. Miller, A.K. Opper, and E.J. Stephenson, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **56**, 253 (2006).
[10] R.H. Dalitz and F. von Hippel, Phys. Lett. **10**, 153 (1964).
[11] A. Gal, Phys. Lett. B **744**, 352 (2015).
[12] see Comment by A. Gal, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 018501 (2015) and Reply by R. Horsley *et al.* (QCDSF-UKQCD Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **92**, 018502 (2015), where the incompleteness of existing LQCD calculations of $\langle\Sigma^0|\delta M|\Lambda\rangle$ is discussed.
[13] Th.A. Rijken, V.G.J. Stoks, and Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. C **59**, 21 (1999).
[14] A. Nogga, Ph.D. Dissertation submitted to the Ruhr-Universität, Bochum (2001), http://www-brs.ub.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/netahtml/HSS/Diss/NoggaAndreas/.
[15] A. Nogga, H. Kamada, and W. Glöckle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 172501 (2002).
[16] J. Haidenbauer, U.-G. Meißner, A. Nogga, and H. Polinder, in *Topics in Strangeness Nuclear Physics*, Lecture Notes in Physics **724**, edited by P. Bydžovský, J. Mareš, and A. Gal (Springer, New York, 2007), pp. 113-140.
[17] A. Nogga, Nucl. Phys. A **914**, 140 (2013) and references to earlier works cited therein.
[18] A. Nogga, Few-Body Syst. **55**, 757 (2014).
[19] Th.A. Rijken, M.M. Nagels, and Y. Yamamoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **185**, 14 (2010).
[20] Y. Fujiwara, Y. Suzuki, and C. Nakamoto, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **58**, 439 (2007).
[21] S.A. Coon, H.K. Han, J. Carlson, and B.F. Gibson, in *Meson and Light Nuclei '98*, edited by J. Adam, P. Bydžovský, J. Dobeš, R. Mach, and J. Mareš (WS, Singapore, 1999), pp. 407-413, arXiv:nucl-th/9903034.
[22] P. Navrátil, G.P. Kamuntavičius, and B.R. Barrett, Phys. Rev. C **61**, 044001 (2000).
[23] D. Gazda, J. Mareš, P. Navrátil, R. Roth, and R. Wirth, Few-Body Syst. **55**, 857 (2014).
[24] R. Wirth, D. Gazda, P. Navrátil, A. Calci, J. Langhammer, and R. Roth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 192502 (2014). Note that with the same Jacobi-coordinate NCSM methodology and the same $NN$ and $YN$ interactions used in the present paper, these authors found ${}^{3}_{\Lambda}$H to be particle-stable, with $\Lambda$ separation energy $B_\Lambda$=110±10 keV for cutoff 600 MeV, consistent with experiment [6] and with Faddeev calculations reported by Haidenbauer *et al.* [16]. CSB from $\Lambda-\Sigma^0$ mixing has no effect in ${}^{3}_{\Lambda}$H calculations.
[25] P. Navrátil, Few-Body Syst. **41**, 117 (2007).
[26] B.F. Gibson and D.R. Lehman, Phys. Rev. C **37**, 679 (1988).
[27] Y. Akaishi, T. Harada, S. Shinmura, and K.S. Myint, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3539 (2000).
[28] E. Hiyama, M. Kamimura, T. Motoba, T. Yamada, and Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. C **65**, 011301(R) (2002).
[29] H. Nemura, Y. Akaishi, and Y. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 142504 (2002).
[30] F. Schulz *et al.* (A1 Collaboration), Nucl. Phys. A **954**, 149 (2016). Adopting their value of $B_\Lambda({}^{4}_{\Lambda}\mathrm{H}) = 2.157 \pm 0.006(\mathrm{stat.}) \pm 0.077(\mathrm{syst.})$ MeV, the observed CSB splittings would change to $233 \pm 92$ keV for $0^+_{\mathrm{g.s.}}$ and to $-83 \pm 94$ keV for $1^+_{\mathrm{exc.}}$. We thank Dr. Patrick Achenbach for briefing us of these values prior to publication.
[31] S. Petschauer, N. Kaiser, J. Haidenbauer, U.-G. Meißner, and W. Weise, Phys. Rev. C **93**, 014001 (2016), and references cited therein to earlier work.